DISCUSSION

A. The offense level should not be increased two levels based upon the number of guns

The USPO increases the offense level based upon USSG. §2K2.1(b)(1)(A) because she calculates the number of firearms under relevant conduct to be seven. PPR ¶24. Mr. Coleman disagrees with this determination. At the time of his arrest on April 5, 2007, Mr. Coleman possessed one firearm which he discarded as he ran from police officers. PPR ¶14, 15. The conduct which the USPO argues is relevant conduct under the guidelines involve straw purchases of guns in Nevada on March 7, 2007. However, in reviewing the three factors described in USSG §1B1.3, comment. (n.9), it is evident that the straw purchases would not be considered relevant conduct. First, the offense of setting up straw purchases is not that similar to the offense of being a felon in possession of a firearm. Second, the purported relevant conduct occurred on only on March 7, 2007, which the offense of conviction occurred approximately one month later. These facts do not support an argument that the offense occurred with regularity. Finally, the time interval between offenses is approximately one month. Given the amount of time that passed, there is nothing to suggest that the straw purchases in March constitutes the same course of conduct as being a felon in possession of a firearm one month later. Because the straw purchases do not constitute relevant conduct, the guns involved in the purchases should not be counted.

The fact that the USPO states that there are 7 firearms indicates that she may also be counting the non-existent rifles to which Mr. Coleman made reference in order to get the undercover agent to appear and bring money on April 5, 2007. However, a search of the car and surrounding areas make it clear that there were never actually any rifles for sale. Because there

2324

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

¹The USPO actually lists the straw purchases under the title "Behavior Not Part of Relevant Conduct" but apparently still counts the guns as relevant conduct. *See* PSR ¶¶6-10, 24.

1

4

5

3

6

7

8 9

10

12

11

14

13

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

were never any rifles, the USPO erred in increasing the guidelines based upon the non-existent guns. The correct offense level in this case should be 13, not 15.

24 Months In Custody is the Appropriate Sentence

In accordance with the plea agreement, Mr. Coleman agrees that the reasonable and appropriate disposition of this case under the guidelines, as well as the factors described in 18 USC §3553(a), is a sentence of imprisonment at the high end of offense level 13 and the relevant criminal history category. Plea Agreement at ¶8. The USPO calculates Mr. Coleman's criminal history category to be III. PSR ¶40. Although Mr. Coleman initially objected to the criminal history category, he has reviewed the priors which are listed in the PSR and believes that they are accurate. Therefore he withdraws his objection to the criminal history category.

A sentence at the high end of offense level 13 and criminal history category III is a sentence of 24 months. The USPO recommends a sentence at the low end of offense level 15 and criminal history category III which also is a sentence of 24 months.

A sentence of 24 months adequately meets the purposes of sentencing as described in 18 USC §3553(a). For example, the nature and circumstances of the offense, being a felon in possession of a firearm is a serious offense and is made more serious by the circumstances surrounding Mr. Coleman's possession of the gun. Because of his actions surrounding the offense, Mr. Coleman has received a two level enhancement for reckless endangerment as well as an agreed upon sentence at the high end of the guidelines.

The nature and seriousness of the offense is balanced with history and characteristics of Mr. Coleman who has a minor criminal history and has been working to support his children. Furthermore, a sentence of 24 months in this case is sufficient to show respect for the law, just punishment and adequate deterrence. It is not an insubstantial amount of time in custody and will serve as a continuing reminder to Mr. Coleman that he needs to take a different direction in United States v. Coleman, CR 07-00284 MJJ 3 Defendant's Sentencing Memo

Assistant Federal Public Defender

United States v. Coleman, CR 07-00284 MJJ

Defendant's Sentencing Memo

22

23

24

25